

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 06 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

A. Allowed Claims and Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated that claims 7-10, 12, 15, 17, and 21 are allowed.

The Examiner next indicated that claims 19, 20, 26, and 27 include allowable subject matter and would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Independent claims 18 and 22 have been amended to include the limitations of claim 19 and claim 26, respectively. Accordingly, amended claims 18 and 22, as well as claims 20, 23-25, and 27-30, which depend from amended claims 18 and 22, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

B. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 22-25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,059,199, issued to Quaney ("Quaney").

By the claim amendments made above, independent claim 22 is now believed to include allowable subject matter and is therefore believed to overcome its rejection as well as the rejections of dependent claims 23-25, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Claims 31, 32, 34, and 35 have been canceled thereby obviating their rejections.

C. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentably obvious over Gavin (U.S. Patent No. 5,655,564) in view of McKann (U.S. Patent No. 4,080,813) and Gehrs et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,444,183) and the Examiner rejected claims 28 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentably obvious over Quaney in view of Russell (U.S. Patent No. 4,976,366).

By the claim amendments made above, independent claim 18 is now believed to include allowable subject matter and is therefore believed to overcome its rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). By the claim amendments made above, independent claim 22 is now believed to include allowable subject matter and is therefore believed to overcome its

rejection as well as the rejection of dependent claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claim 33 has been canceled thereby obviating its rejection.

D. Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejections

In the present Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 18 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,666,349, issued to Gavin, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,444,183, issued to Gehrs et al. By the claim amendments made above, independent claim 18 is now believed to include allowable subject matter and is therefore believed to overcome the obviousness-type double patenting rejections of claim 18.

E. Summary

In the present Office Action, claims 7-10, 12, 15, and 17-35 were examined. Claims 18 and 22-35 are rejected. Claims 18, 20, 22, and 27 are amended and claims 19, 26, and 31-35 are canceled. Claims 7-10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 20-25, and 27-30 are presented for consideration.

Based on the remarks above, Applicants submit that none of the references, alone or in combination, anticipates or makes obvious the invention as presently claimed and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and further examination of the application and the Examiner is respectfully requested to issue a Notice of Allowance at the earliest possible date.

If the Examiner has any questions or believes that a discussion with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

Please apply any credits or charge any deficiencies to our Deposit Account No. 23-1665.

Respectfully submitted,

Norman W. Gavin

Date: September 6, 2006

Reg. No. 42,565

Anthony P. Gangemi
Signature of Attorney
Anthony P. Gangemi
Wiggin and Dana LLP
One Century Tower
New Haven, CT 06508-1832
Telephone: (203) 498-4395
Facsimile: (203) 782-2889

\17667\4\611545.1